

Public defense reform: HB 5676

The Campaign for Justice supports House Bill 5676, which would create the Michigan Public Defense Act.

Two overarching reform goals:

- A system that meets and enforces minimum American Bar Association and State Bar of Michigan principles for public defense delivery systems.
- A system that has adequate state funding.

Essential components of an effective public defense system:

- A state system, created in the judicial branch, of delivering constitutionally adequate public defense services to individuals eligible for appointed counsel at the trial and appellate levels, as well as in delinquency proceedings, including:
 - A 9-member commission to develop a plan and oversee an office of public defense, appointed by the governor after recommendations from the Michigan supreme court, Michigan judges' association, Michigan district judges' association, criminal defense attorneys association of the state, and from the general public.
 - An office of public defense staffed by trained professionals and headed by a chief public defender.
 - An appellate bureau, headed by a chief appellate defender, to oversee appellate defense functions.
 - Regional offices to oversee the local delivery of public defense services. The number and location of regions will be designated by the commission.

Service delivery:

- The commission establishes the plan to deliver services. Delivery is by a mix of:
 - Public defense offices staffed by public employees.
 - Public defense offices under contract with the office of public defense (nonprofit offices, contract defense offices, county offices).
 - Assigned counsel (required to be part of each region's delivery system).

11 Principles:

- Compliance with the 11 Principles of a Public Defense Delivery System is required by statute. The commission establishes policies implementing those principles.
- The office of public defense establishes procedures to implement the commission plan and policies, including: establishing oversight mechanisms, qualifying and appointing counsel, providing training and resources to attorneys providing public defense services, collecting data and preparing reports to the commission and legislature.
- The office of public defense (and its appellate bureau) appoints counsel, based on the plan established by the commission.
- The statute establishes standards for eligibility determinations and for recouping costs for legal defense services.
 - Juveniles must meet with counsel before waiving representation.

Funding:

- A public defense fund is created to receive funding from all sources.
- The state is responsible for funding the system at a level that complies with its obligations under the U.S. and Michigan constitutions to ensure the right to counsel for its residents.

 NOTE: The funding mechanism will be in a separate bill.

Michigan Campaign for Justice

A JUSTICE SYSTEM THAT WORKS FOR ALL



Public defense reform: HB 5676

Who is the Campaign for Justice coalition?

ACLU of Michigan

American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee of

Michigan

American Civil Liberties Union

American Friends Service Committee Criminal

Justice Program

Association for Children's Mental Health

Brad Snavely, Executive Director, Michigan Family

Forum

Brennan Center for Justice at New York University

School of Law

Citizens Alliance on Prisons and Public Spending -

Michigan

Citizens for Traditional Values

Council of Islamic Organizations of Michigan

Criminal Defense Attorneys of Michigan

Criminal Defense Lawyers of Washtenaw County

Crossroads Bible Institute

Constitution Project

Detroit Hispanic Development Corporation

Detroit Life Challenge

Former Michigan Gov. William Milliken

Grand Rapids Bar Association

Hispanic Bar Association of Michigan

Humanity for Prisoners

Innocence Project - Cooley Law School

Interfaith Council for Peace and Justice

Jewish Community Relations Council of

Metropolitan Detroit

Kalamazoo County Bar Association

Legal Aid and Defender Association, Inc.

Legal Services in Michigan - State Planning Body

Macomb County Bar Association

Metropolitan Organizing Strategy Enabling Strength

(MOSES)

Mental Health Association in Michigan

Michigan Association for Children with Emotional

Disorders

Michigan Board of Rabbis

Michigan Catholic Conference

Michigan Council of Private Investigators

Michigan Council on Crime and Delinquency

Michigan County Social Services Association

Michigan Jewish Conference

Michigan Juvenile Detention Association

Michigan Juvenile Justice Collaborative

Michigan League for Human Services

Michigan Prospect

Michigan Public Defense Task Force

Michigan Unitarian Universalist Social Justice

Network

Michigan Women's Justice & Clemency Project

NAACP - Michigan State Conference

National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers

National Association of Legal Investigators

National Association of Social Workers - Michigan

National Conference of Black Lawyers - Detroit

Chapter

National Council of Jewish Women, Greater Detroit

Section

National Lawyers Guild - Detroit & Michigan

Chapter

Partners in Crisis

Prison Fellowship

Temple Kol Ami Social Action Committee

The Provider Alliance

Race Relations Council of Southwest Michigan

Shiawassee County Bar Association

The Specialists, Inc.

Sugar Law Center for Economic and Social Justice

Washtenaw County Office of Public Defender

The Campaign for Justice works in partnership with the State Bar of Michigan and the Governor's Office of Faith Based and Neighborhood Partnerships.

The Michigan Women's Commission supports the concept of public defense reform.

Michigan Campaign for Justice

A JUSTICE SYSTEM THAT WORKS FOR ALL



CAMPAIGN FOR JUSTICE PUBLIC DEFENSE SYSTEM FINANCING

STATE BUDGET PERSPECTIVE:

- The state's FY10 budget includes \$2.9 billion for Public Safety and Judiciary agencies. This represents 6.4% of the overall \$45.2 billion budget.
- The FY10 General Fund (GF) budget includes \$2.36 billion for these same agencies or 29% of the total \$8.13 billion GF budget.
- Included in the Judiciary budget is \$5.8 million for the State Appellate Defender's Office (SADO). Of that amount \$5.2 million is GF, or less than 1/10 of 1% of the state's GF budget is spent on indigent defense.

COUNTY BUDGET PERSPECTIVE:

- Currently public defense costs are financed by local units of government, primarily counties.
- Typically counties finance their court costs with general fund appropriations.
- Revenues that might offset these GF court costs are deposited into the county's GF. These revenues
 might include court fees/fines, judicial salary reimbursements, other state grants, and Court Equity Fund
 payments.
- Ingham County example:
 - o In FY08 the county GF spending was \$81.1 million.
 - o GF spending for law enforcement was \$28.5 million or 35.2% of total GF spending.
 - o GF spending for judicial functions totaled \$19.5 million or 24% of the total GF budget.
 - o The county spent \$1.3 million on indigent defense or 1.6% of the county's GF budget.
 - The county received \$1.94 million in Court Equity Fund (CEF) payments from the state to help offset the costs of overall court operations.
 - O The county also deposited \$6.1 million in revenues related to court functions into their GF.

COSTS:

- Total costs of current system is at least \$83.5 million.
- The \$83.5 million includes the following:
 - o \$67 million spent by counties for circuit and district court public defense
 - \$4.5million spent by municipal district courts for criminal public defense
 - An estimated \$4 million spent by counties for appellate defense
 - o An estimated \$2 million spent by locals for expert witness fees
 - o \$6 million for the State Appellate Defenders Office.
- In 2008 the National Legal Aid & Defender Association (NLADA) published an Evaluation of Trial-Level Indigent Defense Systems in Michigan that was commissioned by the Michigan legislature. The NLADA reported that Michigan would need to increase spending on indigent defense to \$120 million per year in order to reach the average national per capita spending of \$11.86.

Michigan Campaign for Justice

- Cost estimates for a statewide system will involve the following assumptions:
 - o Criminal caseload estimates
 - Attorney caseloads and national standards
 - Salary and fringe costs for public defenders
 - Compensation for contract attorneys & assigned counsel
 - Regional cost differentials
- The cost of operating a public defense system will depend in no small part on how the system is designed. Ways to mitigate the cost include the following:
 - Establish a cost effective mix of public defender employees vs. contract attorneys & assigned counsel
 - Set compensation rates by regions
 - o Local Public Defender offices could be non-governmental entities
 - o In urban areas the local offices could examine the possibility of partnering with universities and law schools.

FUNDING OPTIONS:

- 100% state general fund (GF).
- Capture local dollars already in system and fill in the rest with GF.
- Identify a new revenue source such as an increase in court fines.
- Redirect savings from other state agencies due to implementation.
- A mix of all of the above.

CAPTURE LOCAL DOLLARS ALREADY IN THE SYSTEM:

- If the state takes over the indigent defense system the counties and municipalities will be relieved of almost \$78 million in current costs.
- Currently the local courts collect criminal and civil fees and fines as established in statute. The statutes also define the state/local split. The statutes could be amended to reallocate the splits so that the state retains a larger share. The increased share could be deposited in the public defense fund.
- In FY08 the state provided \$64 million to counties to offset the costs of operating their local trial courts. The payments come from the Court Equity Fund (CEF), which is a state administered fund that includes a mix of court fines/fees and state general fund dollars. The allocation of some or all of these funds could be changed and deposited into the public defense fund.

SYSTEM PHASE -IN:

- Due to the complexity of implementing a statewide system it could take 2-3 years to completely take over the system from the local courts.
- The phase in could begin in FY11 with the appointment of a Commission and the establishment of a central Public Defenders Office. The Commission could then establish an implementation schedule to phase in the system in FY12 and 13.